



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would advance the whole program of preparedness materially. Every public building a fort! There you have efficiency, a kind of preparedness which is indeed concrete.

While our ideas come hard, and we constantly need them in our business, let us carry this thought on a little and be consistent. Why forget our railroad locomotives? Surely each should be mounted with a 42-centimeter howitzer at once. There are no engineering difficulties involved which seem to us insurmountable. Anyhow, every engine has an engineer. It might necessitate the raising of a few bridges, but when everything else around us is rising with such perfect freedom, that would be a small matter. The expense of caring for the gun would by this process be greatly reduced for the reason that its welfare in time of peace or war could be left wholly and appropriately to the fireman. It has always seemed to us strange that guns have not heretofore been exclusively in the charge of firemen. Anyhow, such a saving to our government should not be overlooked. Again, while we are not as expert with mitrailleuses as we might be, yet from what we know of them we feel that at least three might be very properly placed on the top of every watering cart, and at least two on each ice wagon in our national life. As will be readily seen, the watering carts operating night and day would lend themselves especially to a very important aspect of preparedness. The ice cart, being a permanent institution throughout our land, would lend itself particularly for service in the daytime. Then, too, if every Ford automobile were obliged to carry an aeroplane destroyer we would be perfectly prepared, so far as danger from the air is concerned. But why go on? The wealth of suggestions is overwhelming, the possibilities infinite. If the government, for example, were to take over the hat-manufacturing industries and supply each hat with revolving automatic rapid-fire guns, necessarily of a small calibre—we refer to men's hats only—then we would have a citizen soldiery indeed without interrupting the ordinary wheels of industry. Needless to say, ladies' hats lend themselves to infinite possibilities of preparedness treatment, of which the extension of hat-pins is but one instance in point.

Is it not clear that those responsible for our defense in this country are derelict in their duty, lacking in vision, nodding, we may say, at the switch? Preparedness, preparedness for our dear political homes and fire-sides, that is the idea. Steel tips for pointed shoes have received little attention, while suspenders strong enough to throw grenades, so far as we know, have not even been mentioned. But every public building a fort! That need is immediate, pressing, and mandatory. When will those responsible for the defense of this great nation rise to the demands of our enlightened age?

EDITORIAL NOTES

Labor and Preparedness and Peace.

A program for preparedness indorsed by 300,000 members of the Chicago Federation of Labor has been laid before the members of all other labor unions in this country for approval. The program points out that preparedness is needed in the United States, but that it must be based upon physical fitness. Patriotism is also needed, but it must be a patriotism based upon love of country and a country which guarantees liberty and opportunity. The report declares that a great army and navy, unless democratized and placed within the control of the people, with leaders responsible to the people as a whole, will be a powerful instrument for the conversion of the country into a commercial oligarchy. The report emphasizes the importance of industrial organization, the public ownership of arms and munition factories, as well as the mines, forests, and other natural resources supplying raw material, together with the railroads and means of transportation. The committee favors the passage of the Keating child-labor bill, which prohibits interstate transportation of the products of child labor. It would raise the age limit in child labor and compulsory education laws to sixteen years. It would pension mothers for the protection of the children. It would secure clean, healthful living conditions for the poorest of the population. It would provide for outdoor physical training in connection with the public schools to be continued during the summer vacation; this training to include instruction in the laws of health, in woodcraft and nature study, cooking, camp-making, first aid in case of accident. And, not least, it should endeavor to develop the instinct of healthy co-operation. The report says:

"To put guns in the hands of children for this work would be vicious; to imitate guns with sticks would be silly."

It is recommended that organized labor be alive and awake to see that in any system of citizen soldiery the greatest possible freedom and democracy shall prevail; that the men shall be given education in civic affairs and the fullest opportunity for promotion from the ranks. Any military system, it says, "should be democratically officered and controlled by heads directly responsible to the citizens." The report concludes with the statement that the committee is opposed to any increase of the standing army. The danger to the American workmen from foreign countries is not so much the danger of an attack by their governments; the real danger is from the hordes of helpless underfed foreign immigrants who are brought into this country by the great manufacturing interests which want cheap labor.

The American Federation of Labor has proposed a

Labor World Peace Congress to be assembled at the same time and place that the belligerents meet to make the terms which end the world war. This proposal has been sent to the organized labor movement of all countries.

It is evident that labor men everywhere recognize their duty to demand that nothing touching the lives of the workers shall be determined without taking counsel with them.

From such information as we are able to gather we are quite convinced that organized labor, which now means fortunately the farmer organizations of our country, as well as the industrial workers, have not as yet been overcome by the fears of an invasion by any of the belligerents now at war. Furthermore, it is clear that the peace movement must increasingly study and cooperate with the labor movement, for their aims and interests are more and more identical, at least so far as international matters are concerned.

The War and Finance.

The cost of the present war to the seven main belligerents—we mean the direct cost in war loans only—will soon reach the unimaginable amount of \$30,000,000,000, a sum that would build seventy-five Panama Canals. The national war debt of the United Kingdom alone will soon reach \$12,000,000,000. This fact, however, is not so discouraging to Great Britain as it might be did she not remember that the Napoleonic wars left her in debt much more than that amount, and at a time when her income was eight times less and her total wealth ten to twelve times less than at present. Yet, including interest, sinking fund, and pensions, the annual expenditure of Great Britain will soon reach \$3,000,000,000, an amount nearly 25 per cent of England's total income. The situation is no less distressing of course elsewhere in Europe. The present war debt of the four leading allies is nearly \$38,000,000,000, while that of the three central powers, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey, is nearly \$20,000,000,000. The war is now costing \$100,000,000 a day. The total expenditures will soon reach six times the amount expended in our Civil War.

To distribute the burden of taxation at the close of the war, therefore, that it may not hamper trade nor depress the standard of life, is not going to be easy. If the revenue is raised by a graduated income tax, as it ought to be and in all probability will be, it may serve one useful purpose, namely, the abolition of the idle rich class. In any event, as Mr. Sidney Webb has recently pointed out, the rich people are most certainly going to become relatively much poorer as a result of the war.

With spurts of activity here and there, this war will be followed by a general depression of trade. The mil-

lions of unemployed men and women at the close of the conflict will mean a sharp reduction of wages, while prices will remain relatively high. If the rate of wages is sufficiently reduced it will end in an industrial if not a political calamity of some sort. The world is approaching—and we are inclined to think that this includes neutrals as well as belligerents—the greatest economic crisis which it has ever faced. The destruction of wealth leaves society, therefore, the poorer. The burning or destruction of property, even though it be heavily insured, represents a net economic loss. It would thus seem the part of economic wisdom for us all to “prepare” for the long, lean years that are sure to follow.

Mr. James J. Hill, our noted American railroad man and financier, evidently takes this view, for in the *New York Times* for April 9 he emphasizes the importance, the imminent need of “preparedness for peace.” He clearly sees and urges the necessity for new industrial adjustments in our own country. He conceives that “armies and navies are no more necessary for that new order than a wise preparation for the changed conditions of industry that we, as well as others, must face.” Practically all business today is based upon the expansion of an unprecedented credit. The world is spending capital which will not be really created for many years to come. The rate of this expenditure will naturally decrease at the close of the war, and our captains of industry may well take this into consideration now. In Mr. Hill's language, the “only possible course is to live sparingly, buy little, sell and save.” At the close of this war, workmen, many workmen, we fear, will be thrown out of employment. What are we going to do with these men, and what is being done to “prepare” for such a contingency?

Prior to this war each of the powers had great difficulty in meeting its interest charges upon its war debt. These charges will soon be quadrupled. The interest-bearing debt of the United States is not more than \$10 per capita. The total debts of the nations at war will be at the close at least \$220 per capita.

There will soon be plenty of work for the financial organizers. The war will leave the world with vastly depleted raw materials. There will be a much-lessened cargo room and a marked increase of freight rates. The markets for mortgages and other securities will be disturbed and uncertain. The shortage of dwellings will cause higher rents, and the reduction of taxable materials will complicate the problem greatly. The question of tariffs is already receiving attention from disturbed financiers. How the vast amounts of fiat money are to be redeemed, how the decline of exchange is to be met, and how the inevitable mêlée of competition can be controlled, are only a few of the other and

perhaps lesser details. One must dread to think of the poverty and the infinite evils incident to it, a poverty sure to follow. But why go on?

William Jennings Bryan and the League to Enforce Peace. Speaking of the League to Enforce Peace, Mr. Bryan suggests in the columns of the *Commoner* for March that the plans of the league be so amended as to eliminate some of the objections without lessening its effectiveness. Mr. Bryan agrees that the nations should set up a court for the decision of international questions beyond the scope of diplomacy. He suggests that the decisions "be enforceable by two groups": one to be composed of the nations of the western hemisphere and the other to be composed of the nations of the eastern hemisphere. He grants that a third group of Asiatic powers might be necessary. Mr. Bryan's theory is that the decisions of the international court shall be enforced against a State by the nations composing the group of which that State is a member.

He conceives that such an arrangement would cover all disputes except those of nations belonging to different groups. "In such cases sufficient length of time could be given for the parties involved to consider the recommendations of the international body, and it is almost certain that time and investigation would bring about a peaceful settlement." Mr. Bryan adds:

"The modifications proposed would save us from being drawn into European and Asiatic contests, and it would enable us to retain the Monroe Doctrine in its full force and vigor. Such a plan would doubtless receive the approval of the American people because it secures all that is valuable by international agreement, and yet eliminates the dangers embodied in the plan which has been advanced by the League to Enforce Peace. While nothing can be done until the war is over, it is well for the friends of peace to be considering the various suggestions that are being made, for out of discussion comes truth, and truth is that which should be desired above all things else."

Mr. Bryan seems to pass over the word "enforce" as if it presented no difficulties. This is a comfortable manner of treating the League to Enforce Peace, but it lacks conviction. There is probably no nation in the world today, there will be no nation in the world for many generations, willing to sign a treaty which shall make possible the use of force against it.

Germany, Mexico and the United States. In his preface to *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*, Hugo Grotius wrote—it was five years after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock—these words:

"For I very well saw throughout the Christian world so great a license of making war and of running into arms upon every light cause, and sometimes upon none at all, that even the barbarians would have been ashamed to have owned it. And also that, arms being once taken up, there was no reverence at all had to laws, either divine or humane, but just as if some Fury had been sent out to kill and destroy: so war, being begun, a general license was granted to work all manner of mischief whatsoever."

Dr. John Dewey, in a recent number of the *New Republic*, takes occasion to point out that the German system of education has in the main been scientific and specialized, technical and professional; that the English system of education has emphasized the general and humanistic aspect of human development, and that, in his opinion, we in America are as to our educational institutions flopping between the German and English systems. This all may be true. There are many reasons for thinking that it is true, but, measured by results, in the light of the present war, the educational system of America seems fairly well to be holding its own. As for Mexico, 75 per cent of its inhabitants are illiterate, and it is not profitable, therefore, for us to discuss the educational system of that country.

Whatever the educational system, we are nearer war today with Mexico and with Germany than is comfortable to contemplate. The leading facts regarding Mexico are that there is a *de facto* government in that country which we have officially recognized. It is laboriously trying to work out problems which are in no sense our problems. A bandit Indian named Villa has killed a number of American citizens and sacked an American town. We are trying to find this murderer that he may be brought to justice. The *de facto* government in Mexico has, in the light of its agreements with us, aided us as best it can in apprehending him. In this whole situation, especially in the light of our Pan American hopes and professions, there is no more reason for our going to war with Mexico than for our going to war with Siam. Not that there are no grievances, but their settlement cannot be hastened by the mere application of brute force.

Germany is a different case. The supreme failure of the German government has been its inability to appreciate or understand the peoples of other nations. The oft-acknowledged actions contrary to international law, especially the method of warfare which sank the *Lusitania*, the *Arabic*, and the French cross-channel steamer *Sussex*, have become, of course, intolerable. In consequence our Government has notified the Imperial government that, unless it abandons its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight-carrying vessels, the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether. It was not necessary for Mr. Lansing to add that this action of the Government of the United States was taken with "great reluctance," nor that it was taken "in behalf of humanity and the rights of neutral nations."

In spite of all these facts, we must insist that we have no right now to go to war with Germany. Our urgent request that Germany join with us in a treaty providing for a year of discussion before going to war about any question makes it necessary that we should remember

our own proposal in this instance, especially since Germany agreed to our own proposition in principle. Whether there is a better way of settling international disputes than by lining perfectly good workmen of our nation up against perfectly good workmen of another nation that they may compose national difficulties by blowing each other's brains out, or not, is a practical problem for us here and now. Whatever our grievances, the killing of a few Germans more or less will not lessen them nor ameliorate them.

Of course we must insist upon international law with dignity and consistency, but why war? Why ourselves lunge in to make more pertinent still the ancient words of Grotius quoted herein? Why jeopardize the fame and fortunes of our own educational ideals by joining needlessly in this "brawl in the dark"? In the long run our position of sane and judicial insistence will be justified before the bar of humanity, both in the case of Germany and of Mexico, if we only remain sane and judicial.

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY FOR CONTINENTAL LEADERSHIP

By L. S. ROWE

The author of this article is the well-known economist and professor of political science in the University of Pennsylvania. He was a member of the commission which revised and compiled the laws of Porto Rico in 1900; chairman of the delegation of the United States to the First Pan American Scientific Congress which met at Santiago, Chile, in 1908; member of the U. S.-Panama Joint Claims Commission, and secretary of the Second Pan American Scientific Congress, held recently at Washington. He is president of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

THOSE who have been watching the trend of events in the countries of South America have been deeply impressed with the fact that there exists widespread disappointment that the United States has not taken a more definite position of leadership in the maintenance of the neutral rights of the republics of America. It was confidently expected by the people of South America that the United States would make her cause theirs, and that in so doing there would develop a unity of continental policy which would mark the most important step toward true Pan-Americanism.

The outbreak of the European war came so unexpectedly, dealing such a severe blow to the economic and financial interests of all the republics of America, that the first period of bewilderment was followed by a period of anxious questioning with reference to their position as neutrals. The uncertainties and anxieties of the situation were increased by the presence of belligerent squadrons in the South Atlantic and South Pacific. The question of the interpretation of the rules relating to the shipment of supplies ostensibly shipped in pursuance of legitimate commercial transactions, but in reality intended for belligerent cruisers on the high seas, presented a problem so difficult and delicate that no one country could hope alone to grapple with the problem in a satisfactory way. Similarly, the problem of preventing any of the belligerents from making the ports of South America the bases of operations was an exceedingly difficult one, owing in part to the tremendous coast line, and partly to the inadequate facilities for patrolling.

It was here that the opportunity for real leadership presented itself to the United States, a leadership which would have meant the performance of a lasting service to all the republics of this continent, would have bound them to us with the strongest ties of gratitude, and

would have enabled the American continent to perform an historical mission in defense of the rights of neutrals.

When the war broke out all arrangements had been completed for the assembling of a Pan-American Conference in Santiago, Chile, in October, 1914. All the machinery was, therefore, ready for the holding of a congress of neutrals, which might have performed a great service in the more definite formulation of neutral rights and neutral obligations. This great and unexampled opportunity was permitted to slip by, and the result has been that, owing to the lack of co-operation amongst non-belligerent countries, they find themselves at the mercy of the belligerent powers. The healthful restraint imposed on belligerents by reason of the presence of a vigorous and concerted neutral protest has been lacking, and the result has been a marked and disquieting decline in standards of international dealings.

Although the most effective moment for a united stand of the neutral nations of America would have been immediately after the outbreak of the European war, it is not too late to repair at least some of the damage that has been done. The machinery for such a conference is at hand in the International Commission of Jurists provided for by the Pan-American Conference of 1910. This body should be called immediately, and remain in permanent session as a Congress of Neutrals until the close of the war. Its deliberations and results should have to do with the rights which the neutral nations of America are prepared to maintain and the obligations which they are agreed to fulfill. The mere fact that such a congress is in permanent session cannot help but impress itself upon the imagination of the entire civilized world and on the rules of conduct of the belligerent nations. Not only would such a congress serve to preserve the spirit of legality, but it would bind the nations of America with a community of interest and a community of service which would mark an epoch in the history of international relations.

To allow such an opportunity to slip by is to prove ourselves unworthy of the great mission entrusted to the free nations of America; to announce ourselves unworthy of the great privileges that have been conferred upon us, and to proclaim ourselves unable to defend the highest interests of civilization.